

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Official Action dated March 23, 2006. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for a timely and thorough review of the above-referenced patent application. Claims 19-40 are previously pending in the application. Claims 19, 22, 25, 28, 31 and 32 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,659,376 to Uehara et al. in view of US Patent No. 6,352,322 to Nakao. Claims 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 33-40 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 33 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicant respectfully traverses each of the rejections set forth in the Official Action.

The Official Action states correctly that Uehara does not disclose a second housing part covering a periphery of a top surface of the liquid crystal display, as recited by the claimed invention. However, the Official Action then asserts that Nakao discloses a second housing part and that it would be obvious to combine the second housing part of Nakao with the display arrangement of Uehara in order to support the protective window. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion for at least three reasons.

Contrary to the assertion of the Official Action, the ornamental plate 55 of Nakao is not a second housing part as recited by the claimed invention. The independent claims of the present application recite that the second housing part covers the periphery of the LCD. However, the ornamental plate of Nakao does not cover the periphery of the LCD. The LCD of Nakao is seen through display window 53 (Col. 15, lines 32-38). But Fig. 26 of Nakao illustrates that the ornamental plate 55 is positioned well beyond the periphery of the display window 53 (the LCD is not illustrated in Fig. 26). Thus, it appears that the ornamental plate would be well beyond the periphery of the LCD and cannot be considered to be a second housing part as recited by the claimed invention.

Even if the ornamental plate of Nakao may be considered a second housing part, it would not be obvious to combine the second housing part of Nakao with the display arrangement of Uehara in order to support the protective window. The Official Action asserts that the combination of elements 302, 302b, 305 and 312 of Uehara forms the first housing part, as

recited by the claimed invention. However, as clearly illustrated in Fig. 23, these elements support the protective window 303. Thus, it is the first housing part of Uehara that supports the protective window. As Uehara already discloses an element that supports the protective window, there is no motivation to identify a different element to support the protective window. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not consider it obvious to combine the second housing part of Nakao with the display arrangement of Uehara in order to support the protective window.

Even if it would be obvious to combine the second housing part of Nakao with the display arrangement of Uehara in order to support the protective window, such a combination would not result in the display arrangement of the claimed invention. In order to add the ornamental plate 55 of Nakao to the arrangement of Uehara, the protective window 303 of Uehara would have to be moved away from the first housing part (302, 302b, 305 and 312) to enable the ornamental plate to support the protective window, as recited by the claimed invention. However, moving the protective window away from the first housing part would also move the protective window away from the elastic part 321, as can be seen in Fig. 23 of Uehara, such that the elastic part and the protective window would no longer be in contact. Thus, the combination of the second housing part of Nakao with the display arrangement of Uehara would not include an elastic part that contacts an under surface of the protective window, as recited by the claimed invention.

Even though Applicants disagree with the assertion of the Official Action as discussed above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 19, 31 and 32 by adding the recitation of Claim 20 in order to hasten allowance of all claims of the present application. Additionally, Claim 33 has been amended to correct the noted deficiencies.

In view of the remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of independent Claims 19, 31 and 32 is overcome. Since Claims 21-30 depend from independent Claim 19, and Claims 33-40 depends from independent Claim 32, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 21-30 and 33-40 is overcome. As such, all of the present claims of the present application are in condition for immediate allowance.

Appl. No.: 10/086,737
Amdt. dated 06/06/2006
Reply to Office action of March 23, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the Claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. Examiner Duong is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian J. Teague/

Brian J. Teague
Registration No. 55,670

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111